



Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary Management Plan Review  
Public Scoping Meeting Comments

Sept. 30, 2008

6 – 9 p.m.

Makah Marina Conference Center, Neah Bay, WA

In all, 17 people participated in the meeting, excluding sanctuary staff. Meeting attendees were divided into three discussion groups. Each group was facilitated by a sanctuary staff member. An additional staff member served as note-taker. Discussion groups sat around tables facing projected Microsoft Word blank document pages. Facilitators each asked their groups, “what should be Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary’s priorities for the next 5 to 10 years? Note-takers typed each group member’s comments so that the entire group could see them. Facilitators checked in with each participant to verify that his/her typed comments were accurate; the participants could then request changes to the wording. Here are the responses from each of the four groups.

**Group #1**

Facilitator: Andy Palmer

Note-taker: Helene Scalliet

- Tribal council should have had a study done about minerals to see what they were giving up when the sanctuary was created. They need fair representation of what they are giving up if they are not going to be allowed to mine in the ocean. Is there a legal right to the minerals for the tribal members? Do they have minerals to the low tide mark or all the way to the 3-mile state waters limit?
- The sanctuary should support a study to find out how much minerals (lead, mercury, precious metals ...) are present in coastal areas. The tribe needs more knowledge of what is there as resources. What is the sanctuary’s position on minerals mining as it relates to the existing regulations?
- An issue is not only coordination between the sanctuary and the tribes, but also coordination from the national level to the local sanctuary and from the sanctuary to the tribes. Don’t assume there is a trickle-down effect from the national level to the local level (reauthorization, etc), for example if there is a shift on how certain actions will be taken (fishing, etc) after reauthorization. The tribes and the treaty rights should be considered in those national level decisions. Both the

national and local sanctuary offices should work in a truly open, transparent process with the tribes.

- The Advisory Council (AC) and the Intergovernmental Policy Council (IPC) should understand their respective roles with the sanctuary; they currently do not. Their paths don't currently cross, and it is a problem.
- Jobs are an issue here – people of Neah Bay need diversification and minerals mining could be one of the ways to do this. The state of Washington is the most prohibitive of the 5 northwest states with respect to minerals extraction because they are over-protective of the fisheries.
- Olympic Coast is the only sanctuary that encompasses the treaty areas of recognized tribes. We need a different management approach compared to other sanctuaries. Sanctuary needs to capture the spirit of working with the tribes not just as co-managers of the fisheries resources but also in designing management processes that are mutually beneficial and cooperative. The IPC was a starting point, but more work should be done to capture the spirit of the treaties in a broader management perspective.
- The sanctuary was not supposed to interfere with treaty rights (supreme law of the land). The tribes work with geoducks but they need to disturb the sand to do so. They have right to gather geoducks but they are not allowed to disturb the sand – this is a problem.
- The federal government has not worked very closely with the tribes. There doesn't seem to have been much work with the tribes at the time of designation. The tribes weren't presented in the documentation as crucial players in this situation.
- The tribes were natural resource managers for thousands of years before, using oral tradition. The tribal knowledge is not an integral part of the scientific process currently used in resource management. Those traditions would greatly inform science if they were included. They are usually remarkably accurate.
  - Example: many tribes have “first salmon” ceremonies where the first salmon is eaten. The whole village has to be clean (public health aspect). All the fish gets to go by and make it all the way to the headwaters to spawn. In current management practices, most fish is taken before they get to the headwaters.
- One of the 4 goals in the original designation document was to do no-notice drills for oil spill prevention. There has not been a successful no-notice drill in the past 14 years. There should be at least one done annually. The Makah have been leaders in oil spill prevention. There should be better partnership between the sanctuary and the Makah to inform rulemaking (under OPA 90) and to advocate oil spill prevention locally. This would help fulfill goals from the original designation document.
- There should be an annual discussion about issues that may have come up during that year instead of waiting 14 years for a management plan review. This might alleviate some of the perceived conflict between the Sanctuary and the tribes because of better communication. Not something as big as a full management plan review, but a way to gauge interest in issues on a more frequent basis.
- Management plan review every 14 years is not adequate to address changing conditions. There should be a built-in mechanism for community members to address developing issues before they become too big to fix. There should be

direct internet availability for members of the public to make the sanctuary aware of new issues and/or changing conditions.

- The condition report is a qualitative document. There is not enough quantitative information. It does not contain an analysis of the goals and objectives of the initial sanctuary designation document and management plan. The management plan review (MPR) process should produce a quantitative evaluation of the state of the sanctuary resources and evaluate the degrees of success in attaining the original goals and objectives of the sanctuary.
- The Sanctuary Advisory Council (AC) should make a more proactive effort to invite members of the community to come participate at AC meetings. Often few people attend the public comment part of the AC meetings. The AC should make it more accessible for the public to participate.
- AC meetings should be better publicized in the target communities, like flyers at the grocery store, etc... Just having it on the website and the Port Angeles paper may not be enough for the community to really find out about it.
- Communities are remote here on the peninsula. Newsletters could be distributed through the Makah Access Portal in order to reach local communities. A quarterly e-newsletter would be useful (for example like the one at Channel Islands).

## **Group #2**

Facilitator: Liam Antrim

Note-taker: John Barimo

- The sanctuary should provide ocean science educational programs to the children on the Makah reservation and other schools like Clallam Bay.
- Help kids be more enthusiastic about education on areas such as sailing and fishing, and also visiting the sanctuary. To have practical experiences that can be built upon in back in the classroom.
- To have a good science mentoring program for the children.
- The sanctuary should keep the draggers out of the sanctuary. Draggers (bottom trawling) are tearing the bottom up.
- The sanctuary should allow permitting for the exploration and extraction of minerals (such as oil or gas) from areas adjacent from sanctuary, i.e., angular or slant drilling, if it doesn't hurt sanctuary resources.
- The sanctuary should be careful not to engage in regulation of Makah fishing rights. Leave issue to regulators such as the Pacific Fisheries Management Council (PFMC).
- The sanctuary should act as a science based advisory panel and not implement belief based policy. Research that will fill data gaps in the transition to ecosystem based fisheries management. Specifics to include monitoring of apex predators, or sea otter-sea urchin dynamics. Conduct research that is mutually beneficial to tribes and the sanctuary. To be collaborators.
- The sanctuary should work from a research-based approach to address commercial development impacts such as wave energy.
- The sanctuary should reach out to citizens to do citizen activist activities such as the clean coast alliance. Programs designed to engage people in some activity in

- the sanctuary so they can see human impacts in the sanctuary. This will help people take these lessons learned back to their communities.
- The sanctuary should work collaboratively and partner with other groups such as schools or private groups on education programs.
  - The sanctuary should not allow the exploration of minerals, oil and gas if it is going to degrade natural resources within the sanctuary. There is concern that slant drilling or angular drilling could contaminant ground water or other resources, it may be a slow process of contamination over the generations. The sanctuary should consider not only this current generation but the children and their children's generation.
  - The sanctuary should be off limits to corporate interests. What is the purpose of the sanctuary if it allows all types of development?
  - The sanctuary should protect sacred places
  - The sanctuary should be protected as much as possible in conjunction with peoples needs. There is a balance that needs to be maintained.
  - The sanctuary should conduct long-term research projects.

### **Group #3**

Facilitator: Bob Steelquist

Note-taker: Jacqueline Laverdure

- Fisheries management to benefit the tribe. What impact is this park going to have on Fisheries? Marine mammals are part of the fisheries here. What benefit will this Sanctuary be for the indigenous people that have lived here for the millennium?
- Pollution Response – oil
  - Will the tug be here in years to come to protect our national marine environment?
- Further deep sea coral research – lack of data, need of more complete picture.
- Base line data – need data to make intelligent decisions for resources and managing resources.
- Plastics- world-wide problem covering beaches
  - Base line data
  - Cleanups- trash lasts on beach for long time
- Plastics - Charlie Moore ship traveling in Pacific cut across Northern Pacific Gyre and saw large amount of plastics.
  - Coastal alliance cleans beaches and lots of plastic found
  - Some fishermen are very aware and careful with not allowing plastics to go in the sea, others are not as concerned – need more education.
  - Awareness of impacts of plastics on wildlife.
- How do we police these areas of debris with such a hostile shoreline? What are the solutions? Should Sanctuary play a more active role with removal of trash? Hire locals.
- Clean beaches – plastics
  - Education and other preventative measures
- Better coordination with stakeholders especially with tribes. Tribes have been here for thousands of years and live in balance with the ecosystem.

- Derelict fishing gear removal.
  - Ghost fishing is brutal.
  - Impacts to wildlife
  - Education
  - Fishermen could be great partners – need to educate to promote stewardship
- Ghost crab pots in Ozette area.
  - In past we could go in 30 fathoms to fish, now we cannot even go in 50 fathoms without losing gear.
  - Gear lost from storms - need recovery program to assist fishermen.
- Due to remoteness the park, the people who live locally are hearty and best suited to work with the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary. Use people who are already acclimatized to do the work that needs to be done.
- Near shore study needed to find out what type of land -use practices are used to impact Sanctuary resources.
  - Timber
  - Future Development
  - Need base line data
- Economy is not doing very well. Make the peninsula a center for marine oceanography. Need for tourism, kid camps, etc that are focused on marine resources. Promote peninsula for marine research and a center for marine study. If National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) based in Port Angeles, it would be a great opportunity to promote entire peninsula for marine resources. Need for integrated effort to promote marine research and tourism. Use education to share pristine environment with others.
- Use locals for information – they are out here and know what is going on with the resources.
  - Green crabs are at Koitlah Point and Warmhouse Beach
  - Develop relationship with fishermen to gather information
  - Fishermen could help assist locating derelict crab pots.
  - We do not have enough information and we are not using the best sources for that information.
- Should use tribes as co managers for resources.
- We need land facilities, bathrooms on trails, signs, to assist with people who are visiting / viewing the Sanctuary.
  - Permits needed
  - Sustain use of coast with appropriate infrastructure.
  - Maintenance
- Permits needed – not just cooperation issue but may be culturally sensitive area
- The needs of the tribes need to be heavily considered especially when it comes to fishing.
- Need balance between protection and fishing rights. Respect fishermen and the economy, and protect natural resources, at the same time.
- Need for time to do studies that need to be done before more restrictions are put in place and receive courtesy copies of studies done. More available data sharing.
  - Reauthorization bill for the National Marine Sanctuary Act?